

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/832,952	04/12/2001	Toshiaki Ueguri	862.C2197	9892	
5514	7590 05/16/2006		EXAMINER		
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO			VAUGHN, GREGORY J		
	ELLER PLAZA K, NY 10112		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	.,		2178		
			DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		09/832,952	UEGURI ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Gregory J. Vaughn	2178	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addre	ss
A SH WHIO - Exte after - If NO - Failt Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period varie to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinuity will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this comm ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
`	, ==	action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pre-		erits is
Disposit	ion of Claims			
5)	Claim(s) 9-11,13-15,34-42 and 52-57 is/are per 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 9-11,13-15,34-42 and 52-57 is/are rejuding Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or ion Papers  The apperitance is abjected to by the Everying Claim(s) are subjected to the formula of the subject to restriction and/or ion Papers	wn from consideration.  ected.  r election requirement.		
	The specification is objected to by the Examine			
_	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according a second and a second applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Extended and the second and the sec	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR	
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)[ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  Certified copies of the priority documents  Certified copies of the priority documents  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents  application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Sta	age
2) 🔲 Notio 3) 🔲 Infor	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5)  Notice of Informal 6 6) Other:		.2)

Art Unit: 2178

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Action Background

- 1. This action is responsive to the applicant's response, filed on 2/28/2006.
- 2. Applicant has amended claims 9-11, 13-15, 34-36, 39-41 and 52.
- 3. Claims 9-11, 13-15, 34-42 and 52-57 are pending in the case, claims 9, 13, 34, and 39 are independent claims.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - "(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made."
- 5. Claims 9-11, 13-15, 34-38, 39-42 and 52-57 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levac et al. US Patent 6,034,970, filed 7/2/1997, patented 3/7/2000 (hereinafter Levac) in view of Whitledge et al., US Patent 6,925,595, filed 8/5/1998, patented 8/2/2005 (hereinafter Whitledge).

Art Unit: 2178

6. Regarding independent claim 9, Levac discloses a server in Figure 2 at reference sign 28 (shown as "Message Server"). Levac discloses a detection unit for detecting text inserted in a web page. Levac recites: "The data acquisition program may include a Web scanning program, which is configured to monitor one or more Internet Web sites that are of interest to a designated message recipient. Upon detection of a modification to the information content of the Web site, the data acquisition program can update the variable value in the message template with information providing a notification of the modification" (column 10, lines 54-61). Levac also discloses converting the text to phonetic character strings. Levac recites: "As illustrated in FIG. 5, system 10 preferably includes various other types of protocol converters 24a-n that convert messages and variable data to protocols, such as are compatible with fax machines, e-mail systems, HTML files, audio devices (audio.wav)" (column 7, lines 49-53).

Levac further discloses transmitting a character string representing the text to a registered user. Levac recites: "The data acquisition program can then convey the updated message template through automated source interface 22. The notification can simply be a communication alerting the message recipient of the modification (e.g., "www.xxx.com was updated on 1/1/97"), or can include a portion of the modified information content, such as new text" (column 10 lines 61-67).

Levac discloses deleting. Levac recites: "In addition to routing messages to protocol converters 24a-n, message server 14 also transmits server

Art Unit: 2178

commands, such as the activate message command discussed previously.

Other server commands can include a "delete message" command and a "delete all messages" command" (column 9, lines 25-29). Levac fails to disclose deleting character strings from a web page based upon character strings registered in a predetermined file.

Whitledge teaches deleting character strings from a web page based upon character strings registered in a predetermined file. Whitledge disclose consulting a preference file where predetermined conversion preferences are stored. Whitledge recites: "At Step 26, the content converter 16 consults the database 18 to obtain conversion preferences (e.g., conversion preferences to convert the original electronic document requested by the first network device 12 into a converted electronic document for the first network device 12). The conversion preferences can include any of user-preferences, device-conversion preferences, site-specific conversion preferences, or other preferences for content conversion" (column 8, lines 5-13).

Whitledge's conversion process is embodied as a metadata object, wherein the metadata object includes delete capabilities on text based on stored text. Whitledge recites: "In an exemplary preferred embodiment of the present invention, a metadata object is a C++ object that conveys information such as request/response headers, conversion preferences and other information about a "databody" stored in a datapipe object. The datapipe object is also a C++ object. However, metadata objects and datapipe objects other than C++ objects could also be used. A databody is electronic

Art Unit: 2178

document content such as hypertext markup languages (e.g., SGML, HTML, XML, VRML, etc.), text, graphical data, or graphics, animation, audio, video or other content that is stored in a datapipe object" (column 10, lines 33-44).

Whitledge discloses the C++ object with delete capabilities in Table 1 (see column 11) where the sample code shown for the CCMetaData object includes a delete process. Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill, at the time the invention was made to combine the text deletion capabilities of Whitledge with the intelligent messaging system of Levac in order to provide "a method and system for converting the content of electronic data for a desired network device" (Whitledge, column 1, lines 18-19).

7. Regarding dependent claim 10, Levac discloses transmitted text that includes a title of the web page with the text of the web page. Levac recites: "Preferably, the .msa file created by message file generator 23 may incorporate, and in some instances must incorporate, the following information: 1. OWNER: identifies the user who created the file; consists of the length of the user's name followed by the user's name; required stream. 2. FILENAME: identifies the name the file was saved as by the user; consists of the length of the FILENAME followed by the FILENAME; required stream. 3. FILETYPE: identifies the format (for example, .wav or .msw) of the actual message as generated embedded within the .msa file; consists of the length of the FILETYPE followed by the FILETYPE; required stream. 4. DATA: contains the message and associated components, such as text characters or control codes, in the format defined by the FILETYPE stream; consists of the

Art Unit: 2178

length of the DATA array followed by the DATA array; required stream" (column 4, lines 48-67), (compare "title" with "File Name" and "text" with "Data").

- 8. Regarding dependent claim 11, Levac discloses the transmission of a creation date with the text. Levac recites: "Message file generator 23 embeds the actual message in the .msa file together with primary data streams specifying essential message parameters, such as date, time" (column 4, lines 39-42).
- Regarding claims 13-15, the claims are directed toward a method for the apparatus of claims 9-11, respectively, and are rejected using the same rationale.
- 10. Regarding independent claim 34, Levac discloses a reception unit for receiving new text inserted in a web page. Levac recites: ""The data acquisition program can then convey the updated message template through automated source interface 22. The notification can simply be a communication alerting the message recipient of the modification (e.g., "www.xxx.com was updated on 1/1/97"), or can include a portion of the modified information content, such as new text" (column 10 lines 61-67).

Levac also discloses converting the text to synthetic speech. Levac recites: "As illustrated in FIG. 5, system 10 preferably includes various other types of protocol converters 24a-n that convert messages and variable data

Art Unit: 2178

to protocols, such as are compatible with fax machines, e-mail systems, HTML files, audio devices (audio.wav)" (column 7, lines 49-53).

Levac further discloses a speech output means in Figure 5 at reference sign 18h (shown as "Speakers").

Levac and Whitledge disclose the detection unit, deleting unit, conversion unit, and transmission unit as described in the rejection of claim 9 described above.

- 11. **Regarding dependent claim 35**, the claim contains substantially the same subject matter as claim 10, and is rejected using the same rationale.
- 12. **Regarding dependent claim 36,** the claim contains substantially the same subject matter as claim 11, and is rejected using the same rationale.
- 13. Regarding dependent claims 37, Levac discloses outputting a predetermined sound prior to outputting the synthetic speech. Levac recites: "The mailbox notifies the user that a new message has been received" (column 1, lines 34-35).
- 14. **Regarding dependent claims 38**, Levac discloses a computer and a telephone system. Levac recites: "Accordingly, a message generated by a source (e.g., an individual or user, a real-time data source, a sensor or other software applications or hardware devices) can be automatically conveyed to diverse communication devices, such as networked personal computers,

Art Unit: 2178

message marquees (e.g., large character displays), telephone systems" (column 3, lines 49-55).

- 15. **Regarding claims 39-42**, the claims are directed toward a method for the apparatus of claims 34-37, respectively, and are rejected using the same rationale.
- 16. **Regarding claim 52**, the claim contains substantially the same subject matter as claim 9, and is rejected using the same rationale.
- 17. **Regarding claim 53**, the claim contains substantially the same subject matter as claim 34, and is rejected using the same rationale.
- 18. **Regarding claims 54-57**, the claims are directed toward defining the invention's phonetic character string as characters for representing pronunciation of words. Levac discloses phonetic character strings used for pronunciation of words. Levac recites: "Types of messages include text, voice, or text-to-speech messages" (column 3, lines 62-63).

Application/Control Number: 09/832,952 Page 9

Art Unit: 2178

## Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments filed 2/28/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

20. Regarding independent claims 9, 13, 34 and 39, applicant argues that the cited prior art of record "fails to disclose deleting character strings from a file that are the same as character strings registered in a predetermined file" (pages 12-13, of the response filed 2/28/2006). Levac discloses the detection, conversion and transmission of text in a web page as described above. Whitledge teaches a conversion object that stores conversion preferences, including predetermined text strings, said object including delete operations, as described above. Both the Levac and Whitledge inventions are directed toward management of web page content, and the motivation for combining these references is provided above.

## Conclusion

21. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory J. Vaughn whose telephone number is (571) 272-4131. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached at (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 272-2100.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status

information for published applications may be obtained from either Private

PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is

available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center

(EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

STEPHEN HONG SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 11

Gregory J. Vaughn May 9, 2006